Distributed optimization with nonuniform unbounded convex constraint sets and nonuniform step-sizes

Peng Lin and Wei Ren

arXiv:1703.08898v1 [math.OC] 27 Mar 2017

***Abstract*—This paper is devoted to distributed optimization problems using continuous algorithms with nonuniform convex constraint sets and nonuniform step-sizes for general differentiable convex objective functions. The communication graphs are not required to be strongly connected at any time, the gradients of the local objective functions are not required to be bounded when their independent variables tend to infinity, and the constraint sets are not required to be bounded. For continuous-time multi-agent systems, a distributed continuous-time algorithm is first introduced for the case where the step-sizes are nonuniform. Then, a distributed continuous-time algorithm is introduced for the case where nonuniform step-sizes and nonuniform convex constraint sets coexist. It is shown that all agents reach a consensus while minimizing the team objective function in the absence and presence of nonuniform convex constraint sets even when the constraint sets are unbounded. After that, the obtained results are extended to discrete-time multi-agent systems for the case without constraints and the case where each agent remains in a corresponding convex constraint set and the constraint sets might be unbounded. To ensure all agents to remain in a bounded region, a switching mechanism is introduced in the algorithms. It is shown that the distributed optimization problems can be solved, even though the discretization of the algorithms might deviate the convergence of the agents from the minimization of the objective functions. Numerical examples are included to illustrate the obtained theoretical results.**

Keywords: Distributed Optimization, Nonuniform Step-Sizes, Nonuniform Convex Constraint Sets

I. Introduction

As an important research direction of control theory, distributed optimization problems for multi-agent systems have attracted more and more attention from the control community [1]–[19]. The goal of a distributed optimization problem for a multi-agent system is to minimize a desired team objective function cooperatively in a distributed way where each agent can only have access to partial information of the team objective function. During the past few years, several results have been obtained for distributed optimization problems. For example, article [1] introduced a discrete-time projection algorithm for multi-agent systems with state constraints and proved that the optimization problems can be solved when the communication topologies are jointly strongly connected and balanced. Articles [4] and [5] studied a continuous-time version of the work in [1] with convex constraint sets. Article [6] gave a distributed continuous-time dynamic algorithm for distributed optimization, and subsequently, on this basis, articles [7], [8] studied the distributed optimization problem for general strongly connected balanced directed graphs and gave the estimate of the convergence rate of the algorithm. Other works about distributed optimization problems could be found in articles [2], [3], [9]–[19] and the references therein, where new algorithms, e.g., distributed Newton, approximate dual subgradient and zero-gradient-sum algorithms, were given or more complicated cases, e.g., second-order dynamics, asynchronous step-sizes and noise, were considered.

Though many excellent results have been obtained for the distributed optimization problem, many issues need be further studied, e.g., general convex functions, nonuniform convex constraints and nonuniform step-sizes. For the issues of general convex functions and nonuniform convex constraints, most of the existing results require the gradients or subgradients of the convex functions to be bounded and the convex constraints to be identical and little attention has been paid to general convex functions and nonuniform convex constraints, in particular for multi-agent systems with general directed balanced graphs and unbounded gradients. For example, articles [7], [8] studied general convex functions but assumed them to be globally Lipschitz and the graphs are assumed to be strongly connected and balanced. Article [5] studied coercive convex functions with unbounded subgradients but the results are limited to the continuous-time multi-agent systems and the convex constraints sets are assumed to be identical for all agents. Article [1] studied nonuniform convex constraints but the communication graph is complete and all the edge weights are assumed to be equal. Article [18] studied a distributed optimization problem with nonuniform convex constraints and gave conditions to guarantee the optimal convergence of the team objective function, but the subgradients and the convex constraint sets are both bounded. For the issue of nonuniform step-sizes, currently, there are few works concerned about this issue. From a view point of stochastic theory, article [10] studied the distributed optimization problem with nonuniform step-sizes, but by taking its mathematical expectation, the proposed algorithm turned out to be a uniform-step-size one. Article [19] introduced a kind of nonuniform step-sizes but the discontinuous algorithms were employed to realize the consensus of all agents and the convex constraint sets are assumed to be identical.

In this paper, we are interested in studying distributed optimization problems using continuous algorithms with nonuni-

Peng Lin is with the School of Information Science and Engineering, Central South University, Changsha, China. Wei Ren is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of California, Riverside, USA. E-mail: lin_peng0103@163.com, ren@ee.ucr.edu.

form convex constraint sets and nonuniform step-sizes for general differentiable convex objective functions. The communication graphs might not be strongly connected at any time and it is only required that the union of the communication graphs among the time intervals of a certain length be strongly connected. The gradients of the local objective functions considered might not be bounded when their independent variables tend to infinity. The constraint sets might not be bounded as well. First, a distributed continuous-time algorithm is introduced for the case of nonuniform step-sizes. Nonuniform step-sizes mean that the weights of the gradients of the local objective functions in the control input of the agents are nonuniform. That is, the optimal convergence rates of the local objective functions are different, which has great possibility to result in the destruction of the optimal convergence of the team objective function. The existing works (e.g., [1]) usually assumed the step-sizes are uniform and took no consideration of nonuniform step-sizes, and hence their approaches are hard to be applied for the case of nonuniform step-sizes. Our approach is to introduce a kind of step-sizes such that the step-sizes of each agent are constructed only based on its own states and the differences between the step-sizes of all agents vanish to zero as time evolves. Though the step-sizes of all agents tend to the same as time evolves, their differences still heavily affect the consensus stability and optimal convergence of the system, especially when the communication graphs are not strongly connected and the gradients of the local objective functions are unbounded when their independent variables tend to infinity. To overcome this difficulty, we perform our analysis in three steps. The first step is to make full use of the convexity of the objective functions and show that our algorithm ensures that all agents remain in a bounded region for all the time. The second step is to analyze the agent dynamics at some key times and show the consensus convergence of all agents. The third step is to estimate the differences of step-sizes and the consensus errors of all agents and show the optimal convergence of the system. Second, a distributed continuous-time algorithm is introduced for the case where nonuniform step-sizes and nonuniform convex constraint sets coexist. Due to the existence of nonuniform convex constraint sets, this case need take into account the nonlinearity of the consensus and optimal convergence caused by nonuniform convex constraint sets, which renders the analysis of this case to be much more complicated than the first case. In particular when the nonuniform constraint sets are unbounded, the gradients of the local objective functions might be unbounded, which makes the existing approaches become invalid, e.g., [1], [18], where the nonuniform constraint sets and the subgradients were both bounded. To solve the optimization problem for this case, we perform the analysis in four steps. The first step is to use a similar approach to the first case to show that our algorithm ensures that all agents remain in a bounded region. The second step is to use an extension of Babalat's Lemma to show that all agents converge to the intersection of the convex constraint sets. The third step is to estimate the distance from the agents to the convex constraint sets and show that all agents reach a consensus. The fourth step is to estimate the consensus errors and use the estimation of the distance from the agents to the convex constraint sets and the convexity of the objective functions to show the optimal convergence of the optimization problem. Third, we extend the obtained results to discrete-time multi-agent systems, and study the case where each agent remains in its corresponding convex constraint set. Due to the discretization of the system dynamics, the agents might be deviated from the minimization of the objective functions. Such a problem also exists in the centralized optimization system. To deal with it, a switching mechanism is introduced in the algorithms based on each agent's own information under which all agents remain in a bounded region even when the convex constraint sets are unbounded. It is shown that the distributed optimization problems with nonuniform convex constraint sets and nonuniform step-sizes can be solved for the discrete-time multi-agent systems.

This paper takes nonuniform unbounded convex constraint sets, nonuniform step-sizes, general differentiable convex objective functions, general switching graphs and the discretization of the algorithms into account simultaneously for the distributed optimization problems. The nonlinearities caused by these factors are different and the coexistence of these nonlinearities would further result in more complicated nonlinearities. Existing works only addressed a fraction of these factors due to the limitations of the algorithms and the analysis approaches. For example, in [7], [8], the algorithm cannot be directly applied to the case of convex constraint sets due to the adoption of the integrator operator. In [19], the analysis approach cannot be directly applied in this paper, because the anti-interference property of the sign functions with respect to small disturbances is used which becomes invalid when continuous functions are used instead of sign functions. Moreover, in [19], the communication graphs are assumed to be strongly connected at any time and the constraint sets are assumed to be identical, which makes the analysis approach in [19] be unable to be directly applied in this paper as well.

Notation: $\mathbb{R}^m$ denotes the set of all m dimensional real column vectors; $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Z}^+$ denote the integer set and the positive integer set, respectively; $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ denotes the set of all $m\times n$ real matrices; $\mathcal{I}$ denotes the index set $\{1,\ldots,n\}$; $\mathbf{1}$ represents a column vector of all ones with a compatible dimension; s_i denotes the ith component of the vector s; A_{ij} denotes the ijth entry of the matrix A; s^T and A^T denote, respectively, the transpose of the vector s and the matrix A; $||s||$ denotes the Euclidean norm of the vector s; $\frac{\partial}{\partial s}$ denotes the partial differential operator with respect to s; $\nabla f(s)$ denotes the gradient of the function $f(s)$ at s with $[\nabla f(s)]_i=\frac{\partial f(s)}{\partial s_i}$; $Y-X$ denotes the relative complement set of X in Y for any two sets X and Y; $a\gg b$ or $a\ll b$ denotes that the number a is far larger or far smaller than the number b; the symbol / denotes the division sign; and $P_X(s)$ denotes the projection of the vector s onto the closed convex set X, i.e., $P_X(s)=\arg\min_{\bar{s}\in X}\|s-\bar{s}\|$.

II. Preliminaries and problem formulation

A. Preliminaries

Let $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V},\mathcal{E},\mathcal{A})$ be a directed graph of order n, where $\mathcal{V}=\{1,\cdots,n\}$ is the set of nodes, $\mathcal{E}\subseteq\mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{V}$ is the set of edges,

and $\mathcal{A} = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is the weighted adjacency matrix. An edge $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}$ denotes that agent j can obtain information from agent i. The weighted adjacency matrix $\mathcal{A}$ is defined as $a_{ij} \geq \eta$ for some constant $\eta > 0$ if $(j,i) \in \mathcal{E}$ and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. It is assumed by default that $a_{ii} = 0$, i.e., $(i,i) \notin \mathcal{E}$. The Laplacian of the graph $\mathcal{G}$, denoted by L, is defined as $L_{ii} = \sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{n} a_{ij}$ and $L_{ij} = -a_{ij}$ for all $i \neq j$. The graph $\mathcal{G}$ is undirected if $a_{ij} = a_{ji}$ for all i,j, and it is balanced if $\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ji}$ for all i. The set of neighbors of node i is denoted by $N_i = \{j \in \mathcal{V} \mid (j,i) \in \mathcal{E}\}$. A path is a sequence of edges of the form $(i_1,i_2),(i_2,i_3),\cdots$, where $i_j \in \mathcal{V}$. The graph $\mathcal{G}$ is strongly connected, if there is a path from every node to every other node, and the graph $\mathcal{G}$ is connected, if it is undirected and strongly connected [21].

Lemma 1. [21] If the graph $\mathcal{G}$ is strongly connected, the Laplacian L has one zero eigenvalue associated with eigenvalue vector $\mathbf{1}$ and all its rest $n-1$ eigenvalues have positive real parts. Further, if the graph $\mathcal{G}$ is undirected and connected, all the $n-1$ nonzero eigenvalues are positive.

Lemma 2. [22] Let $f_0(\chi) : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ be a differentiable convex function. $f_0(\chi)$ is minimized if and only if $\nabla f_0(\chi) = 0$.

Lemma 3. [23] Suppose that $Y \neq \emptyset$ is a closed convex set in $\mathbb{R}^m$. The following statements hold.
(1) For any $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\|y - P_Y(y)\|$ is continuous with respect to y and $\nabla\frac{1}{2}\|y - P_Y(y)\|^2 = y - P_Y(y)$;
(2) For any $y,z \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and all $\xi \in Y$, $[y - P_Y(y)]^T(y - \xi) \geq 0$, $\|P_Y(y) - \xi\|^2 \leq \|y-\xi\|^2 - \|P_Y(y) - y\|^2$ and $\|P_Y(y) - P_Y(z)\| \leq \|y - z\|$.

B. Problem formulation

Consider a multi-agent system consisting of n agents. Each agent is regarded as a node in a directed graph $\mathcal{G}(t)$, and each agent can interact with only its local neighbors in $\mathcal{G}(t)$. Our objective is to design algorithms using only local interaction and information such that all agents cooperatively find the optimal state that solves the optimization problem

$$\begin{array}{ll}\text{minimize} & \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(s)\\ \text{subject to} & s \in H = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} H_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m,\end{array}$$

where $f_i(s) : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ denotes the differentiable convex local objective function of agent i, and H_i denotes the convex constraint set of $f_i(s)$. It is clear that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(s)$ is also a differentiable convex function. It is assumed that $f_i(s)$ and H_i are known only to agent i. The problem described above is equivalent to the problem that all agents reach a consensus while minimizing the team objective function $\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x_i)$, i.e.,

$$\begin{array}{ll}\text{minimize} & \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x_i)\\ \text{subject to} & x_i = x_j \in H = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} H_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m.\end{array} \tag{1}$$

For simplicity of derivation expression, we only discuss the case of $m = 1$ and the general case of $m \neq 1$ can be analyzed in the same way.

III. Distributed optimization for continuous-time multi-agent systems

In this section, we discuss the distributed optimization problem for continuous-time multi-agent systems. Suppose that the agents satisfy the continuous-time dynamics

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = u_i(t), \quad i \in \mathcal{I}, \tag{2}$$

where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the state of agent i, and $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the control input of agent i.

A. Assumptions and some necessary lemmas

Assumption 1. [19] Each set $X_i \triangleq \left\{x \middle| \nabla f_i(x) = 0\right\}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$, is nonempty and bounded.

From Lemma 2, X_i is the optimal set of $f_i(x)$. From the convexity of $f_i(x)$, X_i is convex. In Assumption 1, we only make an assumption on each $f_i(x)$ rather than the team objective function $\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x)$ because $\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x)$ is global information for all agents and cannot be used by each agent in a distributed way.

Define $X \triangleq \left\{x \middle| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nabla f_i(x) = 0\right\}$. From Lemma 2, X is the optimal set of $\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x)$.

Lemma 4. [19] Under Assumption 1, the following two statements hold:
(1) $\lim_{\|y\|\to+\infty} f_i(y) = +\infty$ for all i and accordingly $\lim_{\|y\|\to+\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(y) = +\infty$.
(2) All X_i, $i \in \mathcal{I}$, and X are nonempty closed bounded convex sets.

Assumption 2. $H \neq \emptyset$.

In Assumption 2, we do not require H_i to bounded and hence H might be unbounded. Let $\mathcal{X}$ denote the optimal set of the problem (1) under Assumptions 1 and 2. We have the following lemma:

Lemma 5. [19] Under Assumptions 1 and 2, $\mathcal{X}$ is a nonempty closed bounded convex set.

Assumption 3. [19] The length of the time interval between two contiguous switching times is no smaller than a given constant, denoted by d_w.

Under Assumption 3, the switching of the graph $\mathcal{G}(t)$ cannot be arbitrarily fast, which prevents the system from exhibiting the Zeno behavior.

Assumption 4. There exists an infinite sequence of swiching times of the graph $\mathcal{G}(t)$, $t_0, t_1, t_2, \cdots$, such that $t_0 = 0$, $0 < t_{j+1} - t_j \leq M$ and the union of all the graphs during each interval $[t_j, t_{j+1})$ is strongly connected for some constant $M > d_w$ and all nonnegative integers j.

Assumption 4 ensures that all agents can communicate with each other persistently.

Suppose that the graph $\mathcal{G}(t)$ is balanced for all t. By rearranging the agent indices, $\frac{L(t)^T+L(t)}{2}$ can be written as $\frac{L(t)^T+L(t)}{2} = \text{diag}\{\frac{L^1(t)^T+L^1(t)}{2}, \cdots, \frac{L^h(t)^T+L^h(t)}{2}\}$, where each $\frac{L^i(t)^T+L^i(t)}{2}$ corresponds to a strongly connected component of the agents. From Lemma 1, each eigenvalue of

$\frac{L^i(t)^T+L^i(t)}{2}$ is nonnegative and hence all eigenvalues of $\frac{L(t)^T+L(t)}{2}$ are nonnegative.

Before the main results, we first present some necessary lemmas: Lemma 6 shows a radial growth property of the derivatives of $f_i(x)$ and Lemma 7 shows some properties of the matrices $L(t)$ and $e^{-L(t)}$.

Lemma 6. Let $f(s) : \Xi \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a differentiable convex function and Y be its minimum set in Ξ, where $\Xi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is a closed convex set. Suppose that $Y \subseteq \Xi$ is closed and bounded. For any $z = \lambda P_Y(y) + (1-\lambda)y$ with $\lambda \in (0,1)$,

$$0 < \nabla f(z)^T \frac{y-P_Y(y)}{\|y-P_Y(y)\|} \leq \nabla f(y)^T \frac{y-P_Y(y)}{\|y-P_Y(y)\|}$$

for any $y \in \Xi - Y$.

Proof: Let $z = \lambda P_Y(y) + (1-\lambda)y$ with $\lambda \in (0,1)$ for any $y \in \Xi - Y$. Clearly, $z \in \Xi - Y$. From the convexity of the function $f(s)$, we have $f(y) - f(z) \geq \nabla f(z)^T(y-z)$ and $f(z) - f(y) \geq \nabla f(y)^T(z-y)$. Thus, $0 = f(y) - f(z) + f(z) - f(y) \geq \big[\nabla f(z) - \nabla f(y)\big]^T(y-z)$. Note that $y \neq z$, $y \neq P_Y(y)$ and $z \neq P_Y(y)$. Hence $\frac{y-z}{\|y-z\|} = \frac{y-P_Y(y)}{\|y-P_Y(y)\|} = \frac{z-P_Y(y)}{\|z-P_Y(y)\|}$, and $\nabla f(y)^T \frac{y-P_Y(y)}{\|y-P_Y(y)\|} = \nabla f(y)^T \frac{y-z}{\|y-z\|} \geq \nabla f(z)^T \frac{y-z}{\|y-z\|} = \nabla f(z)^T \frac{y-P_Y(y)}{\|y-P_Y(y)\|}$, i.e., $\nabla f(y)^T \frac{y-P_Y(y)}{\|y-P_Y(y)\|} \geq \nabla f(z)^T \frac{y-P_Y(y)}{\|y-P_Y(y)\|}$. Furthermore, since $P_Y(y) \in Y$ and Y is the minimum set, from the convexity of the function $f(s)$, we have $0 > f(P_Y(y)) - f(z) \geq \nabla f(z)^T(P_Y(y) - z)$. That is, $\nabla f(z)^T \frac{z-P_Y(y)}{\|z-P_Y(y)\|} > 0$. Recalling that $\frac{y-P_Y(y)}{\|y-P_Y(y)\|} = \frac{z-P_Y(y)}{\|z-P_Y(y)\|}$, we have $\nabla f(z)^T \frac{y-P_Y(y)}{\|y-P_Y(y)\|} > 0$. ■

Lemma 7. Suppose that the graph $\mathcal{G}(t)$ is strongly connected and balanced. Under Assumption 3, the smallest nonzero eigenvalue of all possible $L(t) + L(t)^T$ is lower bounded by a positive constant, where $L(t)$ denotes the Laplacian of $\mathcal{G}(t)$, $\|e^{-L(t)}\| \leq 1$ and $\|e^{-L(t)}x(t) - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T e^{-L(t)}x(t))\| \leq \lambda_e \|x(t) - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T x(t)\|$ for some constant $0 < \lambda_e < 1$.

Proof: Let $\hat{L}(t)$ be a Laplacian matrix such that $\sum_{j=1}^n [\hat{L}(t)]_{ij} = 0$ and the nondiagonal nonzero entries of $\hat{L}(t)$ satisfies that $[\hat{L}(t)]_{ij} = -\eta$ if $[L(t)]_{ij} \leq -\eta$ for all $i \neq j$. According to the definition of $L(t)$, it is easy to see that $L(t) - \hat{L}(t) + L(t)^T - \hat{L}(t)^T$ is positive semi-definite. That is, the smallest nonzero eigenvalue of $L(t) + L(t)^T$ is no smaller than that of $\hat{L}(t) + \hat{L}(t)^T$. Note that the number of all possible $\hat{L}(t)$ is finite and hence from Lemma 1 the smallest nonzero eigenvalue of $\hat{L}(t) + \hat{L}(t)^T$ is lower bounded by a positive constant. Thus, the smallest nonzero eigenvalue of all possible $L(t) + L(t)^T$ is lower bounded by a positive constant.

Since the graph $\mathcal{G}(t)$ is strongly connected and balanced, based on Lemma 1, by analyzing the relationship between $e^{-L(t)}$ and $L(t)$, we have $e^{-L(t)}$ has one simple eigenvalue at 1 associated with the left eigenvector $\mathbf{1}^T$ and the right eigenvalue vector $\mathbf{1}$ and the magnitudes of all its rest $n-1$ eigenvalues are smaller than 1. It follows that $e^{-L(t)}x(t) - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T e^{-L(t)}x(t) = e^{-L(t)}(x(t) - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T x(t))$. Similarly, it can be obtained that $e^{-(L(t)+L(t)^T)}$ has one simple eigenvalue at 1 associated with left eigenvector $\mathbf{1}$ and right eigenvalue vector $\mathbf{1}$, and all the rest eigenvalues are smaller than 1 and upper bounded by a positive constant, denoted by $\lambda_e < 1$. Thus, $\|e^{-L(t)}\| \leq 1$. Note that $\mathbf{1}^T[x(t) - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T x(t)] = 0$ and $e^{-(L(t)+L(t)^T)}$ is a symmetric matrix. By analyzing the relationship between the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors of $e^{-(L(t)+L(t)^T)}$, it follows that $\|e^{-L(t)}(x(t) - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T x(t))\| \leq \lambda_e \|x(t) - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T x(t)\|$. As a result, $\|e^{-L(t)}x(t) - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T e^{-L(t)}x(t))\| \leq \lambda_e \|x(t) - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T x(t)\|$. ■

B. Distributed optimization with nonuniform step-sizes

In this subsection, we design a continuous distributed optimization algorithms with nonuniform step-sizes when there are no constraint sets, i.e, $H_i = \mathbb{R}^m$ for all i. The algorithm is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{q}_i(t) &= \arctan(e^{\|x_i(t)\|}), q_i(0) > 0, \\ u_i(t) &= \textstyle\sum_{j\in N_i(t)} a_{ij}(t)\big(x_j(t) - x_i(t)\big) - \frac{\nabla f_i(x_i(t))}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}} \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

for all i. The step-size of the gradient, $1/\sqrt{q_i(t)}$, is used to make the term $\frac{\nabla f_i(x_i(t))}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}$ tend to zero as $t \to +\infty$. It should be noted here that the step-size $1/\sqrt{q_i(t)}$ is state-dependent and can be nonuniform for all agents. All agents need not share a common time clock and the step-size of each agent can be constructed only based on its own current and past states. The existing works usually assume the step-sizes of all agents to be predesigned and consistent with each other at any time, which exerts a heavy burden on sensing and communication costs of the entire system.

Remark 1. In algorithm (3), the role of the inverse tangent functions and the exponential functions is to ensure $\dot{q}_i(t)$ to be upper and lower bounded. In fact, some other more general functions, e.g., saturation function, can be employed to play the same role. Moreover, the step-sizes used in algorithm (3) are in a special form, and it can also be extended to other functions. For easy readability, we do not give the general form of the functions $q_i(t)$ and the step-sizes.

Let

$$x(t) = [x_1(t)^T, \cdots, x_n^T(t)]^T,$$
$$Q(t) = \mathrm{diag}\{1/\sqrt{q_1(t)}, \cdots, 1/\sqrt{q_n(t)}\}$$

and

$$\nabla f(x(t)) = [\nabla f_1(x_1(t))^T, \cdots, \nabla f_n(x_n(t))^T]^T.$$

Then the system (2) with (3) can be written as

$$\dot{x}(t) = -L(t)x(t) - Q(t)\nabla f(x(t)). \tag{4}$$

For convenience of discussion, under Assumption 4, let $t_{j_0} < t_{j_1} < \cdots < t_{j_{m_j}}$ with $t_{j_0} = t_j$ and $t_{j_{m_j}} = t_{j+1}$ denote all the switching times in the interval $[t_j, t_{j+1})$. In the following, we show the effectiveness of this algorithm to solve the optimization problem (1) when $H_i = \mathbb{R}^m$ for all i. Let $x^*(t) \triangleq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n x_i(t)$.

Lemma 8. Suppose that the graph $\mathcal{G}(t)$ is balanced for all t and Assumptions 1, 3 and 4 hold. For system (2) with

algorithm (3), all $x_i(t)$ remain in a bounded region for all i and all t and all agents reach a consensus as $t \to +\infty$, i.e., $\lim_{t\to+\infty}[x_i(t) - x^*(t)] = 0$ for all i.

Proof: First, we prove that using (3) for (2) all $x_i(t)$ remain in a bounded region and all $\|\nabla f_i(x_i(t))\|$ are bounded for all i and all t.[1] Note that $\pi/4 \leq \arctan(e^{\|x_i(t)\|}) \leq \pi/2$ for all t and all i. There exist a constant $T_0 \geq 0$ such that $2\sqrt{t} > \sqrt{q_i(t)} > \frac{\sqrt{t}}{2}$ for all i and all $t \geq T_0$. Under Assumption 1, from Lemma 4, X and all X_i are nonempty and bounded. There is a sufficiently large closed bounded convex set Y such that $x_i(T_0) \in Y$, $X \subset Y$, $X_i \subset Y$ and $f_i(x_i(t)) - f_i(z) \geq 4\sum_{j=1}^n [f_j(z) - f_j(z_j)]$ for all i, all $z \in X$, all $z_j \in X_j$ and all $x_i(t) \notin Y$.

Consider the Lyapunov function candidate $V_0(t) = \frac{1}{2}\|x(t) - z\mathbf{1}\|^2$ for some $z \in X$ and $t \geq T_0$. After some simple calculations, we have

$$\dot{V}_0(t) = \big(x(t) - z\mathbf{1}\big)^T[-L(t)x(t) - Q(t)\nabla f(x(t))]. \quad (5)$$

Since the graph $\mathcal{G}(t)$ is balanced, then $\mathbf{1}^T L(t) = 0$ and hence $z\mathbf{1}^T L(t)x(t) = 0$. Regarding $\frac{L(t)^T + L(t)}{2}$ as a Laplacian of an undirected graph, we have $-x(t)^T L(t)x(t) = -x(t)^T \frac{L(t)^T + L(t)}{2}x(t) \leq 0$ from the previous analysis below Assumption 4. Since $z \in X$, from the convexity of the function $f_i(x_i(t))$, we have $\nabla f_i(x_i(t))^T(z - x_i(t)) \leq f_i(z) - f_i(x_i(t))$. It follows that $-\big(x(t) - z\mathbf{1}\big)^T Q(t)\nabla f(x(t)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}[f_i(z) - f_i(x_i(t))]$. Note that $f_i(x_i(t)) - f_i(z_i) \geq 0$ since $z_i \in X_i$ for all i. If $x_{i_0}(t) \notin Y$ for some i_0, we have $f_{i_0}(x_{i_0}(t)) - f_{i_0}(z) \geq 4\sum_{j=1, j\neq i_0}^n [f_j(z) - f_j(z_j)]$ for all $z_j \in X_j$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} & -\big(x(t) - z\mathbf{1}\big)^T Q(t)\nabla f(x(t)) \\ \leq\ & \textstyle\sum_{j=1, j\neq i_0}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{q_j(t)}}[f_j(z) - f_j(x_j(t))] \\ \leq\ & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{q_{i_0}(t)}} f_{i_0}(x_{i_0}(t)) - f_{i_0}(z) \\ +\ & \textstyle\sum_{j=1, j\neq i_0}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{q_j(t)}}[f_j(z) - f_j(z_j)] \\ \leq\ & 0. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, we have $\dot{V}_0(t) \leq 0$ for $t \geq T_0$ if there exists an agent i_0 such that $x_{i_0}(t) \notin Y$ for some i_0. This implies that all $x_i(t)$ remain in a bounded region for all i and all t. Further, from the differentiability of $f_i(x)$, it follows that $\|\nabla f_i(x_i(t))\|$ is bounded for all i and all t.

Next, we prove that $\lim_{t_j\to+\infty}[x(t_j) - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T x(t_j)] = 0$. Since $2\sqrt{t} > \sqrt{q_i(t)} > \frac{\sqrt{t}}{2}$ for all i and all $t \geq T_0$, there exists a constant $T_1 > T_0$ for any $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\frac{\|\nabla f_i(x_i(t))\|}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}} < \epsilon_0$ for all $t > T_1$. Consider the Lyapunov function candidate

$$V_1(t) = \|x(t) - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T x(t)\| \quad (6)$$

for $t > T_1$. Calculating the solution of system (2) with (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= e^{-L(t_{j_r})(t - t_{j_r})}x(t_{j_r}) \\ &- \textstyle\int_{t_{j_r}}^t e^{-L(t_{j_r})(t-\tau)}Q(\tau)\nabla f(x(\tau))\mathrm{d}\tau \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

[1]Here, it should be noted that each $\|\nabla f_i(s)\|$ is not assumed to be bounded for all s.

for any $t \in [t_{j_r}, t_{j_{r+1}})$. By simple calculations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x(t_{j+1}) &= e^{-\sum_{r=0}^{m_j-1} L(t_{j_{r+1}} - t_{j_r})}x(t_j) - \textstyle\sum_{r=0}^{m_j-2}\varphi_r \\ &- \textstyle\int_{t_{j_{m_j-1}}}^{t_{j+1}} e^{-L(t_{j_{m_j-1}})(t-\tau)}Q(\tau)\nabla f(x(\tau))\mathrm{d}\tau, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_r &= e^{-\sum_{h=r}^{m_j-2} L(t_{j_{h+1}})(t_{j_{h+2}} - t_{j_{h+1}})} \\ &\times \textstyle\int_{t_{j_r}}^{t_{j_{r+1}}} e^{-L(t_{j_r})(t_{j_{r+1}} - \tau)}Q(\tau)\nabla f(x(\tau))\mathrm{d}\tau. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 7, $\|e^{-L(t_{j_r})(t-s)}\| \leq \|e^{-L(t_{j_r})}\|^{t-s} \leq 1$ for any $t \geq s$. Since $\frac{\|\nabla f_i(x_i(t))\|}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}} < \epsilon_0$ for all $t > T_1$, $\|\varphi_r\| < n\epsilon_0(t_{j_{r+1}} - t_{j_r})$ for all r and hence $\big\|\sum_{r=0}^{m_j-2}\varphi_r + \int_{t_{j_{m_j-1}}}^{t_{j+1}} e^{-L(t_{j_{m_j-1}})(t-\tau)}Q(\tau)\nabla f(x(\tau))\mathrm{d}\tau\big\| \leq n\epsilon_0(t_{j+1} - t_j) \leq nM\epsilon_0$, where the second inequality holds since $t_{j+1} - t_j \leq M$ under Assumption 4. Calculating $V_1(t_{j+1}) - V_1(t_j)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & V_1(t_{j+1}) - V_1(t_j) \\ \leq\ & \|e^{-\sum_{r=0}^{m_j-1} L(t_{j_r})(t_{j_{r+1}} - t_{j_r})}x(t_j) \\ -\ & \tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T e^{-\sum_{r=0}^{m_j-1} L(t_{j_r})(t_{j_{r+1}} - t_{j_r})}x(t_j)\| \\ +\ & \|\textstyle\sum_{r=0}^{m_j-2}\varphi_r - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T\sum_{r=0}^{m_j-2}\varphi_r \\ +\ & \textstyle\int_{t_{j_{m_j-1}}}^{t_{j+1}} e^{-L(t_{j_{m_j-1}})(t-\tau)}Q(\tau)\nabla f(x(\tau))\mathrm{d}\tau \\ -\ & \tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T\textstyle\int_{t_{j_{m_j-1}}}^{t_{j+1}} e^{-L(t_{j_{m_j-1}})(t-\tau)}Q(\tau)\nabla f(x(\tau))\mathrm{d}\tau\| \\ -\ & \|x(t_j) - \tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T x(t_j)\| \\ \leq\ & \|e^{-\sum_{r=0}^{m_j-1} L(t_{j_r})(t_{j_{r+1}} - t_{j_r})}x(t_j) \\ -\ & \tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T e^{-\sum_{r=0}^{m_j-1} L(t_{j_r})(t_{j_{r+1}} - t_{j_r})}x(t_j)\| \\ +\ & 2nM\epsilon_0 - \|x(t_j) - \tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T x(t_j)\| \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

for $t_j > T_1$. Note that $t_{j_{r+1}} - t_{j_r} > d_w$ under Assumption 3. Since each $\mathcal{G}(t_{j_r})$ is balanced, under Assumption 4, the matrix $\sum_{r=0}^{m_j-1} L(t_{j_r})(t_{j_{r+1}} - t_{j_r})$ can be regarded as the Laplacian of a strongly connected balanced graph whose nonzero entries are lower bounded by a positive constant. From Lemma 7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & V_1(t_{j+1}) - V_1(t_j) \\ \leq\ & -(1 - \lambda_e)\|x(t_j) - \tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T x(t_j)\| + 2nM\epsilon_0 \end{aligned}$$

for $t_j > T_1$ and some constant $0 < \lambda_e < 1$.

When $\|x(t_j) - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T x(t_j)\| > 4nM\epsilon_0/(1 - \lambda_e)$, it follows from (8) that $V_1(t_{j+1}) - V_1(t_j) < -2nM\epsilon_0$. Then there exists a constant $T_2 > T_1$ such that $\|x(t_j) - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T x(t_j)\| \leq 4nM\epsilon_0/(1 - \lambda_e)$ for all $t_j > T_2$. Since ϵ_0 can be arbitrarily chosen, it follows that $\lim_{t\to+\infty}[x(t_j) - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T x(t_j)] = 0$. Recall that $\|e^{-L(s)(t-s)}\| \leq 1$ for any $t \geq s$. Since $\|\nabla f_i(x_i(t))\|$ is bounded and $2\sqrt{t} > \sqrt{q_i(t)} > \frac{\sqrt{t}}{2}$ for all i and all $t \geq T_0$, then

$$\lim_{t_{j_r}\to+\infty}\int_{t_{j_r}}^t e^{-L(t_{j_r})(t-\tau)}Q(\tau)\nabla f(x(\tau))\mathrm{d}\tau = 0$$

for any $t_{j_r} < t < t_{j_{r+1}}$. Moreover, similar to the proof of Lemma 7, we have $e^{-L(t)}x(s) - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T e^{-L(t)}x(s)) =$

$e^{-L(t)}(x(s)-\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T x(s)))$ when $L(t)$ is balanced for any $t\geq s$. Let $t_{j_r}<t<t_{j_{r+1}}$. From (7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{t\to+\infty}[x(t)-\tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T x(t)]\\ =\;&\lim_{t\to+\infty}[e^{-L(t_{j_r})(t-t_{j_r})}x(t_{j_r})\\ -\;&\tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T e^{-L(t_{j_r})(t-t_{j_r})}x(t_{j_r})]\\ =\;&\lim_{t\to+\infty}e^{-L(t_{j_r})(t-t_{j_r})}[x(t_{j_r})-\tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T x(t_{j_r})]\\ =\;&0.\end{aligned}$$

That is, $\lim_{t\to+\infty}[x_i(t)-x^*(t)]=0$ for all i. ■

Lemma 9. For the system given by $\dot{q}_i(t)=\arctan(e^{\|x_i(t)\|})$ with $q_i(0)>0$, if $\lim_{t\to+\infty}[x_i(t)-x^*(t)]=0$ for all i, $\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{q_i(t)}{q_j(t)}=1$ for all i,j.

Proof: Note that $\pi/4\leq\arctan(e^{\|x_i(t)\|})\leq\pi/2$ for all i and all t, there exists a constant $T_0>0$ such that $\frac{t}{4}<q_i(t)<4t$ for all $t>T_0$ and all i. Let $\Delta_i(t)=\int_0^t[\arctan(e^{\|x_i(s)\|})-\arctan(e^{\|x_1(s)\|})]\mathrm{d}s/q_1(t)$. It is clear that $q_i(t)=q_1(t)(1+\Delta_i(t)/q_1(t))$ for all i. Since $\lim_{t\to+\infty}[x_i(t)-x^*(t)]=0$, from the continuity of the function $q_i(t)$, there exists a constant $T_1>T_0$ for any $\epsilon_0>0$ such that $\|\arctan(e^{\|x_i(t)\|})-\arctan(e^{\|x_1(t)\|})\|<\epsilon_0$ for all $t>T_1$ and all i. It is clear that $\lim_{t\to+\infty}\Delta_i(T_1)/q_1(t)=0$ and $\lim_{t\to+\infty}|\int_{T_1}^t[\arctan(e^{\|x_i(s)\|})-\arctan(e^{\|x_1(s)\|})]\mathrm{d}s/q_1(t)|<4\epsilon_0$. Since ϵ_0 can be arbitrarily chosen, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{t\to+\infty}\Delta_i(t)/q_1(t)=\lim_{t\to+\infty}[\Delta_i(T_1)\\ +\;&\int_{\bar{t}}^t[\arctan(e^{\|x_i(s)\|})-\arctan(e^{\|x_1(s)\|})]\mathrm{d}s]/q_1(t)=0\end{aligned}$$

and hence $\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{q_i(t)}{q_1(t)}=1$ for all i. Therefore, $\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{q_i(t)}{q_j(t)}=1$ for all i,j. ■

Theorem 1. Suppose that the graph $\mathcal{G}(t)$ is balanced for all t and Assumptions 1, 3 and 4 hold. For system (2) with algorithm (3), all agents reach a consensus and minimize the team objective function (1) as $t\to+\infty$.

Proof: From Lemma 8, all $x_i(t)$ remain in a bounded region for all t and $\lim_{t\to+\infty}[x_i(t)-x^*(t)]=0$ for all i. As a result, $f_i(x_i(t))$ is bounded for all i and all t. From Lemma 9 $\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{q_i(t)}{q_j(t)}=1$ for all i,j. Under Assumption 1, from Lemma 4, X is closed and bounded and hence $f_i(P_X(x_i(t)))$ is bounded for all i. Thus, there exists a constant $T_0>0$ for any $\epsilon_0>0$ such that $\|x_i(t)-x^*(t)\|<\epsilon_0$, $\big|1-\sqrt{\frac{q_i(t)}{q_j(t)}}\big|\big|f_i(x_i(t))\big|<\epsilon_0$ and $\big|1-\sqrt{\frac{q_i(t)}{q_j(t)}}\big|\big|f_i(P_X(x_i(t)))\big|<\epsilon_0$ for all i,j and all $t>T_0$. Moreover, from Lemma 3, we have $\lim_{t\to+\infty}[P_X(x_i(t))-P_X(x^*(t))]=0$ for all i. From the differentiability of $f_i(s)$, we have all $\|\nabla f_i(x_i(t))\|$ are bounded for all i and all t. That is, $\|\nabla f_i(x_i(t))\|<\rho_f$ for some constant $\rho_f>0$. Note that $\frac{\pi}{4}<\arctan(e^{\|x_i(t)\|})<\frac{\pi}{2}$ for all i. From the proof of Lemma 8, there exists a constant $T_1>T_0$ for any $\epsilon_0>0$ such that $\frac{\sqrt{t}}{2}<q_i(t)<2\sqrt{t}$ for all $t>T_1$ and all i. Since $f_i(x_i(t))$ is a continuous function with respect to $x_i(t)$ for all i, let T_1 be sufficiently large such that $\big|f_i(x_i(t))-f_i(x^*(t))\big|<\epsilon_0$ and $\big|f_i(P_X(x_i(t)))-f_i(P_X(x^*(t)))\big|<\epsilon_0$ for all i and all $t>T_1$.

Consider the Lyapunov function candidate $V(t)=\frac{1}{2}\|x^*(t)-P_X(x^*(t))\|^2$ for all $t>T_1$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\dot{V}(t)\\ =\;&-\tfrac{1}{n}[x^*(t)-P_X(x^*(t))]^T\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{\nabla f_i(x_i(t))}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}\\ =\;&-\tfrac{1}{n}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n[x_i(t)-P_X(x_i(t))+x^*(t)-x_i(t)\\ +\;&P_X(x_i(t)-P_X(x^*(t)))]^T\frac{\nabla f_i(x_i(t))}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}},\\ \leq\;&-\tfrac{1}{n}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{f_i(x_i(t))-f_i(P_X(x_i(t)))}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}\\ +\;&\tfrac{1}{n}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{2\|x_i(t)-x^*(t)\|\|\nabla f_i(x_i(t))\|}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}\\ =\;&-\tfrac{1}{n}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{f_i(x_i(t))-f_i(x^*(t))}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}\\ +\;&\tfrac{1}{n}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{f_i(P_X(x_i(t)))-f_i(P_X(x^*(t)))}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}\\ -\;&\tfrac{1}{n}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{f_i(x^*(t))-f_i(P_X(x^*(t)))}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}\\ +\;&\tfrac{1}{n}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{2\|x_i(t)-x^*(t)\|\|\nabla f_i(x_i(t))\|}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}\\ \leq\;&\tfrac{1}{n}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{4\epsilon_0}{\sqrt{t}}-\tfrac{1}{n}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{f_i(x^*(t))-f_i(P_X(x^*(t)))}{\sqrt{q_1(t)}}(1\\ -\;&1+\sqrt{\tfrac{q_1(t)}{q_i(t)}})+\tfrac{1}{n}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{8\epsilon_0\rho_f}{\sqrt{t}}\\ \leq\;&\tfrac{1}{n}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{8\epsilon_0}{\sqrt{t}}-\tfrac{1}{n}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{f_i(x^*(t))-f_i(P_X(x^*(t)))}{2\sqrt{t}}\\ +\;&\tfrac{1}{n}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{8\epsilon_0\rho_f}{\sqrt{t}}\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

where the first inequality has used Lemma 3 and the convexity of the functions $f_i(s)$, i.e.,

$$[x_i(t)-P_X(x_i(t))]^T\nabla f_i(x_i(t))\geq f_i(x_i(t))-f_i(P_X(x_i(t))),$$

and the second and third inequalities have used the fact that $\frac{\sqrt{t}}{2}<q_i(t)<2\sqrt{t}$ for all i and $t>T_1$. Let $Y=\{s\in\mathbb{R}^m\mid\|s-P_X(s)\|\leq l_1\}$ for some constant $l_1>0$ and $\rho=\min_{s\in\bar{\partial}Y}\sum_{i=1}^n[f_i(s)-f_i(P_X(s))]$, where $\bar{\partial}Y$ denotes the boundary of Y. Since $P_X(s)\in X$, from the definition of X, we have $\rho>0$. Moreover, from Lemma 6, $\sum_{i=1}^n[f_i(s)-f_i(P_X(s))]>\rho$ for any $s\notin Y$. Let ϵ_0 be sufficiently small such that $16n\epsilon_0(1+\rho_f)<\rho$. Thus, for any $x^*(t)\notin Y$, $\dot{V}(t)\leq-\frac{\rho-16n\epsilon_0(1+\rho_f)}{2n\sqrt{t}}<0$. Integrating both sides of this inequality from T_1 to t, we have $V(t)-V(T_1)\leq-[\rho/n-16\epsilon_0(1+\rho_f)](\sqrt{t}-\sqrt{T_1})$. This implies that there exists a constant $T_2>T_1$ for any $l_1>0$ such that $\|x^*(t)-P_X(x^*(t))\|\leq l_1$ for all $t>T_2$. In view of the arbitrariness of l_1, letting $l_1\to0$, we have $\lim_{t\to+\infty}\|x^*(t)-P_X(x^*(t))\|=0$. That is, the team objective function (1) is minimized as $t\to+\infty$. ■

C. Distributed optimizaton with nonuniform convex constraint sets and nonuniform step-sizes

In this subsection, we extend the results in subsection 4.2 and design an algorithm for system (2) to solve the distributed optimization problem with nonuniform convex constraint sets, where $H_i\neq\mathbb{R}^m$ for some i. The algorithm is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{q}_i(t)&=\arctan(e^{\|x_i(t)\|}),q_i(0)>0,\\ u_i(t)&=\textstyle\sum_{j\in N_i(t)}a_{ij}(t)\big(x_j(t)-x_i(t)\big)\\ &-[x_i(t)-P_{H_i}(x_i(t))]-\frac{\nabla f_i(x_i(t))}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}.\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

The role of the term $-\frac{\nabla f_i(x_i(t))}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}$ is to make all agents converge to the optimal set of the team objective function and the role of $-[x_i(t)-P_{H_i}(x_i(t))]$ is to make each agent converge to the convex set H_i.

Let $Pz(x(t)) = [x_1(t) - P_{H_1}(x_1(t)), \cdots, x_n(t) - P_{H_n}(x_n(t))]$. Then the system (2) with (10) can be written as

$$\dot{x}(t) = -L(t)x(t) - Pz(x(t)) - Q(t)\nabla f(x(t)). \quad (11)$$

Lemma 10. Let $y(t) \in Y$ for all t, where Y is a closed bounded set. Under Assumption 2, if $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \|y(t) - P_{H_i}(y(t))\| = 0$ for all i, then $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \|y(t) - P_H(y(t))\| = 0$.

Proof: Under Assumption 2, $H \neq \emptyset$. If this lemma does not hold, there must exist a sequence $\{t^k\}$ such that $\lim_{t^k\to+\infty} \|y(t^k) - P_H(y(t^k))\| = \psi$ for some constant $0 < \psi \leq +\infty$. Let $H_\psi = \{y \mid \|y - P_H(y)\| = \psi\}$. Consider the set $H_\psi \cap Y$. From Lemma 3, $\|y - P_H(y)\|$ is a continuous function with respect to y. If $\sum_{i=1}^n \|y - P_{H_i}(y)\| = 0$ for some y, we have $y \in H_i$ for all i and hence $y \in H$, i.e., $\|y(t) - P_H(y(t))\| = 0$. Since Y is a closed bounded set, the inequality $\|y - P_H(y)\| = \psi > 0$ implies that the function $\sum_{i=1}^n \|y - P_{H_i}(y)\|$ on $H_\psi \cap Y$ is lower bounded by a positive constant, denoted by γ. Since $y(t) \in Y$ for all t, $\lim_{t^k\to+\infty} \|y(t^k) - P_H(y(t^k))\| = \psi$ and $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \|y(t) - P_{H_i}(y(t))\| = 0$ for all i, there exists a constant $N > 0$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \|y(t^k) - P_{H_i}(y(t^k))\| - \gamma > -\epsilon$ and $\|y(t) - P_{H_i}(y(t))\| < \epsilon$ for all $t^k > N$ and $t > N$. Let $\epsilon < \frac{\gamma}{n+1}$. It follows that $\sum_{i=1}^n \|y(t^k) - P_{H_i}(y(t^k))\| > \gamma - \epsilon > n\epsilon > \sum_{i=1}^n \|y(t) - P_{H_i}(y(t))\|$ for all $t^k > N$ and $t > N$, which is a contradiction. ∎

Lemma 11. Let $\phi(t) : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a piecewise continuous function with the following properties:
Property 1: $\phi(t)$ is continuous and differentiable on each interval $(t_{j_k}, t_{j_{k+1}})$ and switched at t_{j_k} for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $k = 0, \cdots, m_j - 1$. Moreover, $\phi(t)$ is right continuous and right differentiable at t_{j_k} for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.
Property 2: $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \int_{t_0}^{+\infty} \phi(s)\mathrm{d}s$ exists and is finite, and the right derivative of $\phi(t)$ for any $t \in [t_0, +\infty)$ is bounded, i.e., $|\dot{\phi}(t)| < \omega$ for any $t \in [t_0, +\infty)$ and some constant $\omega > 0$, where $t_0 > 0$ is a constant.
Then, we have that $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \phi(t) = 0$.

Proof: This lemma is an extension of Babalat's Lemma. Its proof is very similar to that of Lemma 4 in [20] and hence omitted. ∎

Theorem 2. Suppose that the graph $\mathcal{G}(t)$ is balanced for all t and Assumptions 1, 3, 4 and 2 hold. For system (2) with algorithm (10), all agents reach a consensus and minimize the team objective function (1) as $t \to +\infty$.

Proof: Note that $\pi/4 \leq \arctan(e^{\|x_i(t)\|}) \leq \pi/2$ for all t and all i. There exists a constant $T_0 > 0$ such that $2\sqrt{t} > \sqrt{q_i(t)} > \frac{\sqrt{t}}{2}$ for all i and all $t > T_0$. Under Assumption 1, X and all X_i are nonempty and bounded. Note from Lemma 5 that $\mathcal{X}$ is nonempty and bounded under Assumptions 1 and 2. There is a closed bounded convex set $Y = \{y \mid \|y - P_X(y)\| \leq P_1\} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ for some constant $P_1 > 0$ such that $x_i(T_0) \in Y$, $X \subset Y$ and $X_i \subset Y$ and $\mathcal{X} \subset Y$ for all i. Let Y be sufficiently large such that $f_i(x_i(t)) - f_i(z) \geq 4\sum_{j=1}^n [f_j(z) - f_j(z_j)]$ for all i, all $z \in \mathcal{X}$, all $z_j \in X_j$ and all $x_i(t) \notin Y$.

Consider the Lyapunov function candidate $V_0(t) = \frac{1}{2}\|x(t) - z\mathbf{1}\|^2$ for some $z \in \mathcal{X}$ and $t \geq T_0$. Calculating $\dot{V}_0(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V}_0(t) &= \big(x(t) - z\mathbf{1}\big)^T[-L(t)x(t) \\ &- Pz(x(t)) - Q(t)\nabla f(x(t))]\end{aligned}$$

for $t > T_0$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 8, we have $-\big(x(t) - z\mathbf{1}\big)^T L(t)x(t) \leq 0$. From the convexity of the function $\frac{1}{2}\|x_i(t) - P_{H_i}(x_i(t))\|^2$, we have $-(x_i(t) - z)^T(x_i(t) - P_{H_i}(x_i(t))) \leq \frac{1}{2}\|z - P_{H_i}(z)\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|x_i(t) - P_{H_i}(x_i(t))\|^2 = -\frac{1}{2}\|x_i(t) - P_{H_i}(x_i(t))\|^2$ where the last inequality holds since $z \in \mathcal{X} \subset H \subset H_i$. As a result, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V}_0(t) &\leq -\tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i(t) - P_{H_i}(x_i(t))\|^2 \\ &- \big(x(t) - z\mathbf{1}\big)^T Q(t)\nabla f(x(t)) \\ &\leq -\big(x(t) - z\mathbf{1}\big)^T Q(t)\nabla f(x(t))\end{aligned}$$

for $t > T_0$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 8 again, it can be proved that all $x_i(t)$ remain in a bounded region and all $\|\nabla f_i(x_i(t))\|$ are bounded for all i. That is, $\|x_i(t) - z\| \leq \rho$ and $\|\nabla f_i(x_i(t))\| < \rho$ for all i, all t and some constant $\rho > 0$. Since $2\sqrt{t} > \sqrt{q_i(t)} > \frac{\sqrt{t}}{2}$ for all i and all $t \geq T_0$, we have $\frac{\|\nabla f_i(x_i(t))\|}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}} < \frac{2\rho}{\sqrt{t}}$ for all $t > T_0$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V}_0(t) &\leq -\tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i(t) - P_{H_i}(x_i(t))\|^2 + \frac{2n\rho^2}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &\triangleq \phi(t)\end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

for $t > T_0$. Since all $x_i(t)$ remain in a bounded region for all t and all i, $\|x_i(t) - z\|$ and $\|x_i(t) - s\|$ for all i and any $s \in H_i$. Note that $\|x_i(t) - P_{H_i}(x_i(t))\| \leq \|x_i(t) - s\|$ and hence $\|x_i(t) - P_{H_i}(x_i(t))\|$ and $\|\dot{x}(t)\|$ are bounded for all t and all i. Thus, $V(t)$ and $|\dot{\phi}(t)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |[x_i(t) - P_{H_i}(x_i(t))]^T\dot{x}(t)| + \frac{n\rho^2}{\sqrt{t^3}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i(t) - P_{H_i}(x_i(t))\|\|\dot{x}(t)\| + \frac{n\rho^2}{\sqrt{t^3}}$ are both bounded for all $t > T_0$ as well. Integrating both sides of (12) from T_0 to $+\infty$, it follows that $\int_{T_0}^{+\infty} \phi(s)\mathrm{d}s < V(T_0) + V(+\infty)$ is also bounded. Note that $\phi(t)$ is continuous and right differentiable in each interval $(t_{r_j}, t_{r_{j+1}})$ and right continuous at t_{r_j} for all t_{r_j}. From Lemma 11, $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i(t) - P_{H_i}(x_i(t))\| = 0$. That is, $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \|x_i(t) - P_{H_i}(x_i(t))\| = 0$ for all i. Recall that $\|\nabla f_i(x_i(t))\| < \rho$ for all i and all t. Similar to the proof of Lemma 8, by considering the Lyapunov function candidate defined in (6) for $t > T_0$, it can also be proved that

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}[x_i(t) - x^*(t)] = 0$$

for all i, where $x^*(t)$ be defined in the previous subsection. From Lemma 9, $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{q_i(t)}{q_j(t)} = 1$ for all i, j. Under Assumptions 1 and 2, from Lemma 5, $\mathcal{X}$ is a nonempty closed bounded convex set. Hence, from Lemma 3, $\lim_{t\to+\infty}[P_\chi(x_i(t)) - P_\chi(x^*(t))] = 0$.

Next, we prove that the team objective function (1) is minimized as $t \to +\infty$. Since $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \|x_i(t) - P_{H_i}(x_i(t))\| = 0$ and $\lim_{t\to+\infty}[x_i(t) - x^*(t)] = 0$ for all i, we have $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \|x^*(t) - P_{H_i}(x^*(t))\| = 0$ for all i. Since all $x_i(t)$ remain in a bounded region, $x^*(t)$ remains in a bounded region. Thus, $\|x^*(t) - s\|$ for any $s \in H$ and hence $\|x^*(t) - P_H(x^*(t))\|$ are bounded for all t. From Lemma 5, $\mathcal{X}$ is a nonempty closed bounded convex set. It follows that $f_i(x^*(t))$

and $f_i(P_X(x^*(t)))$ are both bounded for all i and all t. From Lemma 10, we have $\lim_{t\to+\infty}\|x^*(t)-P_H(x^*(t))\|=0$. Therefore, there exists a constant $T_1>T_0$ for any $\epsilon_0>0$ such that $\|x_i-x^*(t)\|<\epsilon_0$, $\|P_\chi(x_i(t))-P_\chi(x^*(t))\|<\epsilon_0$, $\big|1-\sqrt{\frac{q_i(t)}{q_j(t)}}\big||f_i(x^*(t))|<\epsilon_0$, $\big|1-\sqrt{\frac{q_i(t)}{q_j(t)}}\big||f_i(P_X(x^*(t)))|<\epsilon_0$ and $\|x^*(t)-P_H(x^*(t))\|<\epsilon_0$ for all i,j and all $t>T_1$.

Note that all $f_i(s)$ are differentiable functions. Let T_1 be sufficently large such that $|f_i(x_i(t))-f_i(x^*(t))|<\epsilon_0$ and $|f_i(x^*(t))-f_i(P_H(x^*(t)))|<\epsilon_0$ for all $t>T_1$. Consider the Lyapunov function candidate

$$V_1(t)=\frac{1}{2}\|x^*(t)-P_\chi(x^*(t))\|^2 \tag{13}$$

for all $t>T_1$. After some calculations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dot V_1(t) &= -[x^*(t)-P_\chi(x^*(t))]^T\tfrac{1}{n}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\Big[\frac{\nabla f_i(x_i(t))}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}\\ &+ (x_i(t)-P_{H_i}(x_i(t)))\Big]\end{aligned}$$

Since $P_\chi(x^*(t))\in H_i$ for all i, from Lemma 3, we have $[x^*(t)-P_\chi(x^*(t))]^T(x^*(t)-P_{H_i}(x_i(t)))\geq 0$ for all i. Note that $\sum_{i=1}^n(x_i(t)-P_{H_i}(x_i(t)))=\sum_{i=1}^n(x^*(t)-P_{H_i}(x_i(t)))$. It follows that $[x^*(t)-P_\chi(x^*(t))]^T\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n(x_i(t)-P_{H_i}(x_i(t)))\geq 0$. Thus, similar to (9), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\dot V_1(t)\\ \leq\ & -[x^*(t)-P_\chi(x^*(t))]^T\tfrac{1}{n}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{\nabla f_i(x_i(t))}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}\\ =\ & -\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n[x_i(t)-P_\chi(x_i(t))+x^*(t)-x_i(t)\\ +\ & P_\chi(x_i(t))-P_\chi(x^*(t))]^T\frac{\nabla f_i(x_i(t))}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}},\\ \leq\ & -\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{f_i(x_i(t))-f_i(P_\chi(x_i(t)))}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}\\ +\ & \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{2\|x_i(t)-x^*(t)\|\|\nabla f_i(x_i(t))\|}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}\\ =\ & -\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{f_i(x_i(t))-f_i(x^*(t))-f_i(P_\chi(x_i(t)))+f_i(P_\chi(x^*(t)))}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}\\ -\ & \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{f_i(x^*(t))-f_i(P_H(x^*(t)))}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}\\ -\ & \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{f_i(P_H(x^*(t)))-f_i(P_\chi(x^*(t)))}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}\\ +\ & \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{2\|x_i(t)-x^*(t)\|\|\nabla f_i(x_i(t))\|}{\sqrt{q_i(t)}}\\ \leq\ & \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{6\epsilon_0}{\sqrt{t}}-\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{f_i(P_H(x^*(t)))-f_i(P_\chi(x^*(t)))}{\sqrt{q_1(t)}}\\ \times\ & \Big(1-1+\sqrt{\frac{q_1(t)}{q_i(t)}}\Big)+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{4\epsilon_0\rho}{\sqrt{t}}\\ \leq\ & \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{10\epsilon_0}{\sqrt{t}}-\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{f_i(P_H(x^*(t)))-f_i(P_\chi(x^*(t)))}{2\sqrt{t}}\\ +\ & \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{4\epsilon_0\rho}{\sqrt{t}},\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality has used Lemma 3, the convexity of $\mathcal{X}$ and the convexity of the functions $f_i(s)$, i.e.,

$$[x_i(t)-P_X(x_i(t))]^T\nabla f_i(x_i(t))\geq f_i(x_i(t))-f_i(P_X(x_i(t))),$$

and the last two inequalities has used the fact that $\frac{\sqrt{t}}{2}<q_i(t)<2\sqrt{t}$ for all i and $t>T_0$.

In the following, we use the properties of the point $P_H(x^*(t))$ to show the optimal convergence of the system. Define $l_0=\max_{s\in H}\|s-P_\mathcal{X}(s)\|$. Let $E=\{s\in\mathbb{R}^m\mid\|s-P_\mathcal{X}(s)\|\leq l_1\}$ for some constant $0<l_1\leq l_0$ and $\beta=\min_{s\in H\cap\bar\partial E}\sum_{i=1}^n[f_i(s)-f_i(P_\mathcal{X}(s))]$, where $\bar\partial E$ denotes the boundary of E. Since $P_\mathcal{X}(s)\in\mathcal{X}$, from the definition of $\mathcal{X}$, we have $\beta>0$. From Lemma 6, $\sum_{i=1}^n[f_i(P_H(x^*(t)))-f_i(P_\mathcal{X}(P_H(x^*(t))))]>\beta$ for any $P_H(x^*(t))\notin E$. Let ϵ_0 be sufficiently small such that $(20n+8n\rho)\epsilon_0<\beta$. It follows that for any $t>T_1$ and any $P_H(x^*(t))\notin Y$,

$$\dot V_1(t)\leq-\tfrac{\beta}{2n\sqrt{t}}+\tfrac{20+8\rho}{2\sqrt{t}}\epsilon_0<0.$$

Integrating both sides of this inequality from T_1 to t, we have $V_1(t)-V_1(T_1)\leq-(\beta/n-20\epsilon_0-8\rho\epsilon_0)(\sqrt{t}-\sqrt{T_1})$. This implies that there exists a constant $T_2>T_1$ for any $0<l_1\leq l_0$ such that $\|P_H(x^*(t))-P_\mathcal{X}(x^*(t))\|\leq l_1$ for all $t>T_2$. In view of the arbitrariness of l_1, letting $l_1\to 0$, we have $\lim_{t\to+\infty}\|P_H(x^*(t))-P_\mathcal{X}(x^*(t))\|=0$. Since $\lim_{t\to+\infty}\|x^*(t)-P_H(x^*(t))\|=0$ and $\lim_{t\to+\infty}[x_i(t)-x^*(t)]=0$, we have $\lim_{t\to+\infty}\|x_i(t)-P_\mathcal{X}(x^*(t))\|=0$ for all i. That is, all agents reach a consensus and minimize the team objective function (1) as $t\to+\infty$. ■

Remark 2. In the existing works, the distributed optimization problems were considered usually under the assumption that the step-sizes of the gradients are uniform and explicitly time-dependent for all agents. That is, the step-sizes should be consistent with each other at any time. In algorithms (3) and (10), we do not make such an assumption and the step-sizes of the gradients rely on the states rather than the time clock. The step-sizes need not have the same value at any time and instead they are usually nonuniform, which greatly relaxes the synchronization requirement on the system. In [10], a distributed optimization problem with nonuniform step-sizes was considered, but the problem was studied in the stochastic sense and the step-sizes are uniform in the deterministic sense.

Remark 3. In our previous work [19], nonuniform step-sizes were considered but the analysis approach is hard to be applied directly here because this paper is different in nature from [19] in three aspects. First, the convex constraint sets considered in [19] are uniform while the convex constraint sets considered in this paper are nonuniform. Different convex constraint sets might yield different nonlinearities. The coupling of different convex constraint sets would yield more complicated nonlinearities, which makes the analysis in this paper much more complicated than that in [19]. Second, the communication graphs in [19] are assumed to be strongly connected at any time while the graphs in this paper are assumed to be jointly strongly connected, which is more general and also much harder to analyze. Third, in [19], sign functions are used for the interactions between agents which can compensate for the inconsistent local gradients between neighbors and make the design and analysis easier. In contrast, in this paper, a kind of linear continuous consensus functions are used instead. Though the use of the linear continuous functions makes the solution of the system smoother, they do not have the anti-interference property with respect to small disturbances as the sign functions, which also makes the analysis of the system much more complicated than that in [19].

IV. Distributed optimization for discrete-time multi-agent systems

In this section, we discuss the distributed optimization problem for discrete-time multi-agent systems. Suppose that

the agents satisfy the discrete-time dynamics

$$x_i((k+1)T) = u_i(kT), \quad i \in \mathcal{I}, \tag{14}$$

where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the state of agent i, $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the control input of agent i, and $T > 0$ is the sample time. In the following, we use "(k)" instead of "(kT)" when no confusion rises.

A. Assumptions and some necessary lemmas

In Sec. 2, when we define the weighted adjacency matrix $\mathcal{A}$, we assume by default that $a_{ii} = 0$. In this section, for discussion of discrete-time multi-agent systems, we need to redefine a_{ii} and make an assumption about the weighted adjacency matrix $\mathcal{A}$ as shown in the following assumption.

Assumption 5. [18] For all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $a_{ii}(k) \geq \eta$ for some constant $\eta > 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^n a_{ij}(k) = 1$ and $\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ji}(k) = 1$.

Under Assumption 5, the adjacency matrix of the graph $\mathcal{G}(k)$ is doubly stochastic and its diagonal entries are nonzero. Assumption 5 is used to generate convex combinations of the agents' states such that the influence of each agent's state is equal in the final consensus value in the distributed optimization algorithms shown later.

Assumption 6. [18] There exists an infinite sequence of switching times of the graph $\mathcal{G}(k)$, $k_0, k_1, k_2, \cdots$, such that $k_0 = 0$, $0 < k_{j+1} - k_j \leq M$ and the union of all the graphs during each interval $[k_j, k_{j+1})$ is strongly connected for some positive integer M and all nonnegative integers j.

Similar to Assumption 4, Assumption 6 ensures that all agents can communicate with each other persistently.

Assumption 7. [1] There exists a scalar $\delta > 0$ and a vector $\bar{x} \in H$ such that $\{\xi | \|\xi - \bar{x}\| \leq \delta\} \subset H$.

Assumption 7 ensures that H contains at least an interior point.

B. Distributed optimization with nonuniform step-sizes

In this subsection, we design a discrete-time distributed optimization algorithm with nonuniform step-sizes when there are no constraint sets. i.e, $H_i = \mathbb{R}^m$ for all i. The algorithm is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
q_i(k+1) &= q_i(k) + \arctan(e^{\|x_i(k)\|})T, q_i(0) > 0,\\
u_i(k+1) &= v_i(k) - gr_i(k)T,\\
v_i(k) &= \textstyle\sum_{j\in N_i(k)} a_{ij}(k)x_j(k),\\
gr_i(k) &= \begin{cases} 0, \text{ if } \nabla f_i(v_i(k))^T(v_i(k) - c_i)\\ < \|\nabla f_i(v_i(k))\|^2\|v_i(k) - c_i\|T/\sqrt{q_i(k)}\\ \text{ and } \|v_i(k) - P_{X_i}(v_i(k))\| \geq d_i,\\ \frac{\nabla f_i(v_i(k))}{\sqrt{q_i(k)}}, \text{ otherwise,}\end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $c_i \in X_i$ is a constant vector and $d_i > 0$ is a constant for each i.

Due to the discretization of the system dynamics, the agents might be deviated from the minimization of the objective functions. Such a problem also exists in the centralized optimization system. To deal with it, a switching mechanism is introduced in (15) based on each agent' own information, under which the gradient term would not be too large to result in the divergence of the system. This will be shown in the proof of Theorem 3.

Theorem 3. Suppose that Assumptions 1, 5 and 6 hold. For system (14) with algorithm (15), all agents reach a consensus and minimize the team objective function (1) as $k \to +\infty$.

Proof: Consider the Lyapunov function candidate $V_0(k) = \max_i \|x_i(k) - z\|$ for some $z \in X$. It is clear that $\|v_i(k) - z\| \leq \max_i \|x_i(k) - z\| = V_0(k)$. In the following, we first prove that $\|x_i(k+1) - z\| \leq \|v_i(k) - z\|$ when $\|v_i(k) - z\|$ is sufficiently large so as to show that all agents remain in a bounded region. It is clear that when $gr_i(k) = 0$, $\|x_i(k+1) - z\| = \|v_i(k) - z\|$. Thus, we only need to prove $\|x_i(k+1) - z\| \leq \|v_i(k) - z\|$ when $\|v_i(k) - c_i\|$ is sufficiently large and $\nabla f_i(v_i(k))^T(v_i(k) - c_i) \geq \|\nabla f_i(x_i(k))\|^2\|v_i(k) - c_i\|T/\sqrt{q_i(k)}$. Suppose that $\|v_i(k) - z\|$ is sufficiently large. Under Assumption 1, from Lemma 4, X and all X_i are nonempty, closed and bounded. Let $d_D = \max_{y_1,y_2\in X\cup_{i=1}^n X_i} \|y_1 - y_2\|$ and $\Omega_i = \{s \mid \|s - 0.5z - 0.5c_i\| \leq l_1\}$ for some constant $d_D \ll l_1 \ll \|v_i(k) - z\|$. Since $l_1 \ll \|v_i(k) - z\|$, it follows that $0.5\|v_i(k) - s\| \leq \|v_i(k) - z\| \leq 2\|v_i(k) - s\|$ for all $s \in \Omega_i$. Since $\|v_i(k) - z\|$ is sufficiently large, we can select $\|v_i(k) - z\|$ such that $f_i(v_i(k)) > f_i(s)$ for any $s \in \Omega_i$. Moreover, there exists a vector, $b_i \in \Omega_i$, such that $v_i(k)$, $x_i(k+1)$, c_i and b_i on a common hyperplane, $\|v_i(k) - b_i\| = \|v_i(k) - c_i\|$ and $\|b_i - c_i\| > hd_D$ for some constant $h > 0$. Let β_0, β_z, β_{c_i}, β_{b_i} and β_{bc} denote, respectively, the angle between the vectors $v_i(k) - z$ and $v_i(k) - c_i$, the angle between the vectors $v_i(k) - z$ and $\nabla f_i(x_i(k))$, the angle between the vectors $v_i(k) - c_i$ and $\nabla f_i(x_i(k))$, the angle between the vectors $v_i(k) - b_i$ and $\nabla f_i(x_i(k))$ and the angle between the vectors $v_i(k) - b_i$ and $v_i(k) - c_i$. It follows from the cosine law that $\cos\beta_0 = \frac{\|v_i(k)-z\|^2 + \|v_i(k)-c_i\|^2 - \|z-c_i\|^2}{2\|v_i(k)-z\|\|v_i(k)-c_i\|} \geq 1 - \frac{\|z-c_i\|^2}{2\|v_i(k)-z\|\|v_i(k)-c_i\|} \geq 1 - \frac{d_D^2}{\|v_i(k)-c_i\|^2}$ and hence $\sin\beta_0 \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}d_D}{\|v_i(k)-c_i\|}$. Similarly, it can be obtained that $\sin\beta_{bc} \geq \frac{hd_D}{\|v_i(k)-c_i\|} \geq \frac{\sqrt{2}h}{2}\sin\beta_0$. Here, we further select b_i such that $\beta_z + \beta_{bc} = \beta_{b_i}$, which can always be realized from the definition of the set Ω_i. From the convexity of the functions $f_i(s)$, we have $0 < f_i(v_i(k)) - f_i(s) \leq \nabla f_i(v_i(k))^T(v_i(k) - s)$. This means that $\beta_z, \beta_{c_i}, \beta_{b_i} \in [0, \pi/2)$ for all i. Since $\beta_z \leq \beta_{c_i} + \beta_0$ from the angle relationship of β_z, β_{c_i} and β_0, it follows that $\cos\beta_z \geq \cos(\beta_{c_i} + \beta_0) = \cos\beta_{c_i}\cos\beta_0 - \sin\beta_{c_i}\sin\beta_0$. Note that $\sin\beta_0 \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}d_D}{\|v_i(k)-c_i\|} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}d_D}{\|v_i(k)-z\|}$. It follows that $2\|v_i(k) - z\|\cos\beta_z - \cos\beta_{c_i} = 2\|v_i(k) - z\|[\cos\beta_{c_i}\cos\beta_0 - \sin\beta_{c_i}\sin\beta_0 - \frac{\cos\beta_{c_i}}{2\|v_i(k)-z\|}] \geq 2\|v_i(k) - z\|[\sin\beta_{bc}\cos\beta_0 - \sin\beta_0 - \frac{\sqrt{2}\sin\beta_0}{8d_D}] \geq 2\|v_i(k) - z\|\sin\beta_0[h\cos\beta_0 - 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{8d_D}]$. Note that $\lim_{\|v_i(k)-z\|\to+\infty}\cos\beta_0 = 1$ from the cosine law. Let $h \gg 1 + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{8d_D}$. When $\|v_i(k) - z\|$ is sufficiently large and $\nabla f_i(v_i(k))^T(v_i(k) - c_i) \geq \|\nabla f_i(x_i(k))\|^2\|v_i(k) - c_i\|T/\sqrt{q_i(k)}$, we have $2\|v_i(k) - z\|\cos\beta_z > \cos\beta_{c_i} = \frac{\nabla f_i(v_i(k))^T(v_i(k)-c_i)}{\|\nabla f_i(x_i(k))\|\|v_i(k)-c_i\|} \geq \|\nabla f_i(x_i(k))\|T/\sqrt{q_i(k)}$. Note that $-\nabla f_i(x_i(k))T/\sqrt{q_i(k)} = x_i(k+1) - v_i(k)$. It follows from the triangle relationship that $\|v_i(k) - z\| \geq \|x_i(k+1) - z\|$

for all i. Summarizing the above analysis, we have $V_0(k+1)-V_0(k)\leq 0$ when $\max_i\|x_i(k)-z\|$ is sufficiently large. Therefore, all $\|x_i(k)\|$ remain in a closed bounded region, denoted by Ω. Since all $f_i(s)$ are differentiable, $\|\nabla f_i(x_i(k))\|$ is bounded, i.e., $\|\nabla f_i(x_i(k))\|<\rho$ for some constant $\rho>0$, for all i.

Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, there exists a constant $T_0>0$ such that $\frac{kT}{4}<q_i(k)<4kT$ for all $k>T_0$. Let $\bar{\Omega}_i=\{s\mid\|s-P_{X_i}(s)\|<d_i\}$. From Lemma 2, $\nabla f_i(v_i(k))^T(v_i(k)-c_i)\geq f_i(v_i(k))-f_i(c_i)>0$ for any $v_i(k)\in\Omega-\bar{\Omega}_i$. Moreover, note that $\|\nabla f_i(v_i(k))\|$ and $\|v_i(k)-c_i\|$ are both upper and lower bounded by positive constants for any $v_i(k)\in\Omega-\bar{\Omega}_i$. Then there exists a constant $T_1>T_0$ such that $\nabla f_i(v_i(k))^T(v_i(k)-c_i)\geq\|\nabla f_i(v_i(k))\|^2\|v_i(k)-c_i\|T/\sqrt{q_i(k)}$ when $\|v_i(k)-P_{X_i}(v_i(k))\|\geq d_i$ for all $k>T_1$. Thus, from (15), $gr_i(k)=\frac{\nabla f_i(x_i(k))}{\sqrt{q_i(k)}}$ for all $k>T_1$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 8, it can be proved that $\lim_{k\to+\infty}[x_i(k)-x_j(k)]=0$ for all i,j.

Now, we prove that $\lim_{k\to+\infty}\|x_i(k)-P_X(x_i(k))\|=0$. Consider the Lyapunov function candidate $V_1(k)=\sum_{i=1}^n\|x_i(k)-z\|^2$ for some $z\in X$. Under Assumption 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\|x_i(k+1)-z\|^2\\
\leq\ &\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\|v_i(k)-\frac{\nabla f_i(v_i(k))T}{\sqrt{q_i(k)}}-z\|^2\\
=\ &\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\|v_i(k)-z\|^2+\frac{\|\nabla f_i(v_i(k))T\|^2}{q_i(k)}\\
-\ &\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{2\nabla f_i(v_i(k))^TT}{\sqrt{q_i(k)}}(v_i(k)-z)\\
\leq\ &\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j\in N_i(k)}a_{ij}(k)\|x_j(k)-z\|^2+\frac{4n\rho^2T}{k}\\
-\ &\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{2T}{\sqrt{q_i(k)}}(f_i(v_i(k))-f_i(z))\\
=\ &\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\|x_i(k)-z\|^2+\frac{4n\rho^2T}{k}\\
-\ &\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{2T}{\sqrt{q_i(k)}}(f_i(v_i(k))-f_i(z))
\end{aligned}$$

for all $k>T_0$, where the first inequality has used the convexity of $f_i(s)$. Let $x^*(k)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n x_i(k)$. Since $\lim_{k\to+\infty}[x_i(k)-x_j(k)]=0$ and all $f_i(s)$ are differentiable for all i,j, there exists a constant $T_2>T_1$ for any $\epsilon_1>0$ such that $|v_i(k)-x^*(k)|<\epsilon_1$ and $|f_i(v_i(k))-f_i(x^*(k))|<\epsilon_1$ for all $k>T_2$. Thus, $V_1(k+1)-V_1(k)\leq\frac{4n\rho^2T}{k}-\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{2T}{\sqrt{q_i(k)}}(f_i(x^*(k))-f_i(z)-\epsilon_1)$. The rest proof is very similar to that of Theorem 1 and hence omitted. ■

C. Distributed optimization with nonuniform step-sizes and nonuniform convex constraint sets

In this subsection, we design a discrete-time distributed optimization algorithm with nonuniform step-sizes and nonuniform convex constraint sets where $H_i\neq\mathbb{R}^m$ for some i and each agent i needs to remain in its corresponding constraint set H_i.

The algorithm is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
q_i(k+1)\ &=q_i(k)+\arctan(e^{\|x_i(k)\|})T, q_i(0)>0,\\
u_i(k+1)\ &=P_{H_i}[v_i(k)-gr_i(k)T],\\
v_i(k)=\ &\textstyle\sum_{j\in N_i(k)}a_{ij}(k)x_j(k),\\
gr_i(k)=\ &\begin{cases}0,\ \text{if }\nabla f_i(v_i(k))^T(v_i(k)-c_i)\\ <\|\nabla f_i(v_i(k))\|^2\|v_i(k)-c_i\|T/\sqrt{q_i(k)}\\ \text{and }\|v_i(k)-P_{X_i}(v_i(k))\|\geq d_i,\\ \frac{\nabla f_i(v_i(k))}{\sqrt{q_i(k)}},\ \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}
\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

where $x_i(0)\in H_i$, $c_i\in X_i$ is a constant vector and $d_i>0$ is a constant for each i. Let $\varphi_i(k)=P_{H_i}[v_i(k)-\alpha_{ik}\nabla f_i(x_i(k))]-[v_i(k)-\alpha_{ik}\nabla f_i(x_i(k))]$ for $i\in\mathcal{I}$, where $\alpha_{ik}=\frac{T}{\sqrt{q_i(k)}}$.

Let $\Psi(k,s)=\Pi_{j=s}^k\mathcal{A}(j)=\mathcal{A}(k)\cdots\mathcal{A}(s)$ for all $k\geq s$ be the transition matrix of the system (14) with algorithm (16).

Lemma 12. [18] Suppose that Assumption 2 holds. Let $y_i\in\mathbb{R}^m$, $i\in\mathcal{I}$, be vectors such that $y_i\neq P_H(y_i)$. If $y_i\in H_i$, $i\in\mathcal{I}$, there exist a pair of agents i,j, $i\neq j$ such that $\|y_i-P_H(y_i)+y_j-P_H(y_j)\|<\|y_i-P_H(y_i)\|+\|y_j-P_H(y_j)\|$.

Lemma 13. Under Assumptions 2, 5, 6 and 7, there exist a closed bounded set $\Omega\subseteq\mathbb{R}^m$ and constants $0\leq c_\mu<1$, $h>0$ and $T_0>0$ such that $x_i(k)\in\Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{\|x_i(k)-P_H(x_i(k))\|^2+\|\varphi_i(k+1)\|^2}\\
\leq\ &\textstyle\sum_{j\in N_i(k)}a_{ij}(k)\|x_j(k)-P_H(x_j(k))\|+\frac{h}{\sqrt{k}}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_i\|x_i(k)-P_H(x_i(k))\|\\
\leq\ &\textstyle\sum_{r=s}^{k-1}hc_\mu^{\frac{k-r-1}{nM+4M}}/\sqrt{r}\\
+\ &hc_\mu^{\frac{k-s}{nM+4M}}\max_i\|x_i(s)-P_H(x_i(s))\|
\end{aligned}$$

for all i and $k>s>T_0$.

Proof: Similar to the proof of Theorem 3, it can be proved that $\|v_i(k)-\frac{\nabla f_i(v_i(k))}{\sqrt{q_i(k)}}T-z\|\leq\|v_i(k)-z\|\leq\max_i\|x_i(k)-z\|$ for some $z\in H$ when $\|x_i(k)-z\|$ is suffciently large. From Lemma 3, $\|v_i(k)-\frac{\nabla f_i(x_i(k))}{\sqrt{q_i(k)}}T-z\|\geq\|P_{H_i}(v_i(k)-\frac{\nabla f_i(x_i(k))}{\sqrt{q_i(k)}})-z\|$. Thus, $\max_i\|x_i(k+1)-z\|\leq\max_i\|x_i(k)-z\|$ when $\max_i\|x_i(k)-z\|$ is sufficiently large. This implies that all agents remain in a closed bounded region, denoted by $\bar{\Omega}$. Since $\bar{\Omega}$ is closed and bounded, there exists a closed bounded convex set Ω such that $\bar{\Omega}\subseteq\Omega$. That is, each agent remains in Ω. Moreover, similar to the proof of Theorem 3, it can also be proved that there exists a constant $T_0>0$ such that $gr_i(k)=\frac{\nabla f_i(x_i(k))}{\sqrt{q_i(k)}}$ and $\frac{kT}{4}<\sqrt{q_i(k)}<4kT$ for all $k>T_0$.

Since each $f_i(x)$ is differentiable, it exists and hence each $\left\|\nabla f_i(x_i(k))\right\|$ is bounded for all i,k. Following the lines of the proof of Lemma 9 in [18], this lemma can be proved. But it should be clarified that for the case where $\|x_i(s)-P_H(x_i(s))\|\neq 0$ for all i and $s>T_0$, there exists a constant $0\leq c_\mu<1$ such that $c_{ks}\leq c_\mu$ for any $k-s=nM+4M$, when it has been proved that there exists a constant $0\leq c_{ks}<1$ for any $k-s=nM+4M$ such

that $\|x_i(k)-P_H(x_i(k))\| \leq c_{ks}\sum_{j=1}^n[\Psi(k-1,s)]_{ij}\|x_j(s)-P_X(x_j(s))\|+2\sum_{r=s}^{k-1}\frac{h}{\sqrt{r}}$ for all i. If this is not true, then, for all $i\in\mathcal{I}$, there exists a sequence of vectors, denoted by $\{x_i^g\in H_i\cap\Omega, g=0,1,2,\cdots\}$, and a sequence of constants $\{0\leq c_{ks}^g<1, g=0,1,2,\cdots\}$ for $k-s=nM+4M$ such that $\lim_{g\to+\infty}c_{ks}^g=1$ and $\|x_i(k)-P_H(x_i(k))\|=c_{ks}^g\sum_{j=1}^n[\Psi(k-1,s)]_{ij}\|x_j(s)-P_X(x_j(s))\|+2\sum_{r=s}^{k-1}\frac{h}{\sqrt{r}}$ where $x_j(s)=x_j^g$ for all j. Since all $H_i\cap\Omega$ are closed and bounded for all i, the sequence of vectors, $\{x_i^g\in H_i\cap\Omega, g=0,1,2,\cdots\}$, must have a subsequence of vectors, denoted by $\{\hat{x}_i^g\in H_i\cap\Omega, g=0,1,2,\cdots\}$, whose limits exist. Denote $\lim_{g\to+\infty}\hat{x}_i^g=\hat{x}_i$. It is clear that $\hat{x}_i\in H_i\cap\Omega$ and $\|x_i(k)-P_H(x_i(k))\|=\sum_{j=1}^n[\Psi(k-1,s)]_{ij}\|x_i(s)-P_X(x_i(s))\|+2\sum_{r=s}^{k-1}\frac{h}{\sqrt{r}}$ for $k-s=nM+4M$ where $x_j(s)=\hat{x}_j$ for all j. This implies from the analysis in the proof of Lemma 9 in [18] that all the nonzero vectors $x_i(k)-P_H(x_i(k)$ have the same direction for all i, which contradicts with Lemma 12. ■

Theorem 4. Suppose that Assumptions 2, 5, 6 and 7 hold. For system (14) with algorithm (16), all agents reach a consensus and minimize the team objective function (1) as $t\to+\infty$.

Proof: From Lemma 13, all agents remain in a closed bounded region and there exist constants $0\leq c_\mu<1$, $h>0$ and $T_0>0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_i(k+1) &\leq \max_i\|x_i(k)-P_H(x_i(k))\|+\tfrac{h}{\sqrt{k}}\\ &\leq \sum_{r=s}^{k-1}hc_\mu^{\frac{k-r-1}{nM+4M}}/\sqrt{r}+\tfrac{h}{\sqrt{k}}\\ &+ hc_\mu^{\frac{k-s}{nM+4M}}\max_i\|x_i(s)-P_H(x_i(s))\|\end{aligned}$$

for all $k>s>T_0$ and all i. Note that $\|x_i(t)-s\|$ is bounded for any $s\in H_i$. It follows that $\max_{i,x_i(t)\in H_i}\|x_i(t)-P_H(x_i(t))\|$ is bounded, and hence $\varphi_i(k+1)\leq\frac{2h}{1-c_\mu}/\sqrt{s}+hh_1c_\mu^{\frac{k-s}{nM+4M}}$ for some constant $h_1>0$. Let $k=2s$. Note that the decreasing rate of the function $1/\sqrt{s}$ as $s\to+\infty$ is smaller than that of the function $c_\mu^{\frac{s}{nM+4M}}$. It follows that when s is sufficiently large, it can be obtained that $\frac{h}{1-c_\mu}/\sqrt{s}>hh_1c_\mu^{\frac{s}{nM+4M}}$. Then it is not hard to see that when k is sufficiently large, $\varphi_i(k)\leq h_2/\sqrt{s}=h_2/\sqrt{k/2}$ for some constant $h_2>0$. Then similar to the proof of Theorem 1, this theorem can be proved. ■

V. Simulations

Consider a multi-agent system with 8 continuous-time agents in $\mathbb{R}^2$. The communication graph is randomly switched between the strongly connected balanced subgraphs of the graph shown in Fig. 1 for algorithms (3), (10) and (16). The local objective functions are adopted as $f_1(x_1)=\frac{1}{2}x_{11}^2+\frac{1}{2}x_{12}^2$, $f_2(x_2)=\frac{1}{2}(x_{21}+1)^2+\frac{1}{2}x_{22}^2$, $f_3(x_3)=\frac{1}{2}x_{31}^2+\frac{1}{2}(x_{32}+1)^2$, $f_4(x_4)=\frac{1}{2}(x_{41}+1)^2+\frac{1}{2}(x_{42}+1)^2$, $f_5(x_5)=\frac{1}{4}x_{51}^4+\frac{1}{4}x_{52}^4$, $f_6(x_6)=\frac{1}{4}(x_{61}+1)^4+\frac{1}{4}x_{62}^4$, $f_7(x_7)=\frac{1}{4}x_{71}^4+\frac{1}{4}(x_{72}+1)^4$ and $f_8(x_8)=\frac{1}{4}(x_{81}+1)^4+\frac{1}{4}(x_{82}+1)^4$, where x_{i1} and x_{i2} denote the 1st and 2nd components of x_i. First, we let $H_i=\mathbb{R}^2$. By simple calculations, we have the team objective function $\sum_{i=1}^8 f_i(s)$ is minimized if and only if $s=[-0.5,-0.5]^T$. The simulation results for algorithm (3) are shown in Fig. 2.



Fig. 1. One undirected graph.



Fig. 2. State trajectories of all agents using (3).

All agents finally converges to the point $s=[-0.5,-0.5]^T$, which is consistent with Theorem 1. Then we adopt the constrained convex sets as $H_1=\{s\in\mathbb{R}^2\mid\|s-[0,0]^T\|\leq 1\}$, $H_2=\{s\in\mathbb{R}^2\mid\|s-[1,0]^T\|\leq 1\}$, $H_3=\{s\in\mathbb{R}^2\mid\|s-[0,1]^T\|\leq 1\}$ and $H_4=\{s\in\mathbb{R}^2\mid\|s-[1,1]^T\|\leq 1\}$. By simple calculations, we have the team objective function $\sum_{i=1}^8 f_i(s)$ is minimized if and only if $s\doteq[0.2929,0.2929]^T$. The simulation results for algorithms (10) and (16) are shown in Figs. 3-4. All agents finally converge to the point $s\doteq[0.2929,0.2929]^T$ as $t\to+\infty$, which is consistent with Theorems 2 and 4.

VI. Conclusions

In this paper, distributed optimization problems with nonuniform step-sizes and nonuniform possibly unbounded convex constraint sets were studied for general differentiable convex objective functions. Four algorithms were introduced. The first two algorithms were used to deal with continuous-time multi-agent systems, and the last two were used to deal with discrete-time multi-agent systems. For the first three algorithms, it has been shown that the team objective function is minimized with nonuniform step-sizes in the absence and



Fig. 3. State trajectories of all agents using (10).



Fig. 4. State trajectories of all agents using (16).

presence of nonuniform convex constraint sets. For the fourth algorithm, it has been shown that the distributed optimization problem can be solved with nonuniform step-sizes and nonuniform convex constraint sets coexistent even when each agent remain in its corresponding constraint set.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Nedić, A. Ozdaglar, P. A. Parrilo, "Constrained consensus and optimization in multi-agent networks", IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 55, no. 4, pp.922-938, 2010.

[2] A. Nedić, and A. Ozdaglar, "Distributed Subgradient Methods for Multi-agent Optimization", IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 48-61, 2009.

[3] A. Nedić, and A. Ozdaglar, "Distributed optimization over time-varying directed graphs", IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 60, no. 3 pp. 601-615, 2015.

[4] G. Shi, K. H. Johansson and Y. Hong, "Reaching an Optimal Consensus: Dynamical Systems That Compute Intersections of Convex Sets", IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 610-622, 2013.

[5] Z. Qiu, S. Liu and L. Xie, "Distributed constrained optimal consensus of multi-agent systems", Automatica, vol. 68, pp. 209-216, 2016.

[6] J. Wang and N. Elia, "A control perspective for centralized and distributed convex optimization," in proceedings of IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, pp. 3800-3805, 2011.

[7] B. Gharesifard and J. Cortés, "Distributed Continuous-Time Convex Optimization on Weight-Balanced Digraphs", IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 781-786, 2014.

[8] S. S. Kia, J. Cortés, "Distributed convex optimization via continuous-time coordination algorithms with discrete-time communication", Automatica, vol. 55, pp. 254-264, 2015.

[9] E. Wei, A. Ozdaglar and A. Jadbabaie, "A Distributed Newton Method for Network Utility Maximization," in Proceedings of the 50th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and European Control Conference, 2011, pp. 6612-6617.

[10] K. Srivastava, and A. Nedić, "Distributed Asynchronous Constrained Stochastic Optimization", IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing, vol.5, no.4, pp.772-790,2011.

[11] M. Zhu and S. Martínez, "An Approximate Dual Subgradient Algorithm for Multi-Agent Non-Convex Optimization", IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 1534-1539. 2013.

[12] B. Johansson, T. Keviczky, M. Johansson, and K. H. Johansson, "Subgradient methods and consensus algorithms for solving convex optimization problems," in Proceedings of IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, 2008, pp. 4185-4190.

[13] J. Lu, C. Y. Tang, P. Regier and T. D. Bow, "Gossip Algorithms for Convex Consensus Optimization Over Networks," IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 56, no. 12, pp. 2917-2923. 2011.

[14] J. Lu, C. Y. Tang, "Zero-gradient-sum algorithms for distributed convex optimization: the continuous-time case", IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 57, no. 9, pp. 2348¨C2354, 2012.

[15] K. Kvaternik and L. Pavel, "A Continuous-Time Decentralized Optimization Scheme With Positivity Constraints", in proceedings of IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, pp. 6801-6807, 2012.

[16] Q. Liu and J. Wang, "A Second-Order Multi-Agent Network for Bound-Constrained Distributed Optimization", IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 60, no. 12, pp. 3310-3315, 2015.

[17] N. Chatzipanagiotis and M. Zavlanos, "A Distributed Algorithm for Convex Constrained Optimization Under Noise", IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 61, no. 9, pp. 2496-2511, 2016.

[18] P. Lin, W. Ren and Y. Song, "Distributed Multi-agent Optimization Subject to Nonidentical Constraints and Communication Delays," Automatica, vol. 65, no.3, pp. 120-131, 2016.

[19] P. Lin, W. Ren and J. A. Farrell, "Distributed optimization with the consideration of switching directed graphs, nonuniform step-sizes, finite-time convergence, and convex set constraint," IEEE Transations on Automatic Control, available online.

[20] P. Lin, K. Qin, H. Zhao and M. Sun, "A new approach to average consensus problems with multiple time-delays and jointly-connected topologies," Journal of the Franklin Institute, vol. 349, no. 1, pp. 293-304, 2012.

[21] C. Godsil and G. Royle, Algebraic Graph Theory. New York: Springer-Verlag, 2001.

[22] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. Convex Optimization, Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[23] F. Facchinei and J. Pang. Finite-Dimensional Variational Inequalities and Complementarity Problems, Springer-Verlag New York Inc., 2003.